



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO. 09/003,325	FILING DATE 01/06/98	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR PARKER	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. D-6524A
-------------------------------	-------------------------	--------------------------------	--------------------------------

ARTHUR G YEAGER
112 W ADAMS ST
SUITE 1305
JACKSONVILLE FL 32202-3853

LMC1/0319

EXAMINER MARTIN, A

ART UNIT 2712	PAPER NUMBER 4
------------------	-------------------

DATE MAILED: 03/19/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/003,325

Applicant(s)

Jeffrey Parker

Examiner

Andrew Martin

Group Art Unit

2712

☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 6, 1998

☐ This action is **FINAL**.

☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

Disposition of Claims

☒ Claim(s) 12 and 51-108 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

☒ Claim(s) 12 and 51-108 is/are rejected.

☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

☐ Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.

Application Papers

☒ See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.

☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on _____ is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.

☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).

☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been
☐ received.

☐ received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) _____

☐ received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

*Certified copies not received: _____

☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).

Attachment(s)

☒ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892

☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). _____

☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413

☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948

☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152

--- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES ---

Art Unit: 2712

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 12, 51-57, 59-60, 63-79, and 83-108 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fabris et al.

In regards to **claims 12 and 51**, Fabris shows a similar device in figs. 1, 7, 9, 11 and 12 in his system and method of controlling the field of view controls of camera 140 and 141, a means for controlling the field of view variables of camera as shown (Figure 9E), at least two remote control devices (Column 42, Line 30) where this system is for use by relatively unskilled operators, that means more than one operator using at least two remote control devices, which are capable of sending commands to the means for controlling the field of view variables of the cameras and comprising the steps of: automatically tracking at least one of the remote control devices by touch screen on the remote control device, by selecting a camera and issuing command, remembering at least one specific field of view of the camera per control device (Column 12, Lines 12-30) where six preset conditions for each camera is defined. Issuing a field of view variable command using touch screen from at least one remote controller device (Column

Art Unit: 2712

27, Line 61 to Column 28, Line 53). Changing at least one of the field of view variables defining the camera field of view to change the field of view of the camera to a different field of view remembered. However, although Fabris does not show remote controllers to remember the field of view, Fabris does show remembering at least six preset conditions (field of view) of the camera. And Fabris also does not exemplify automatically tracking of at least one remote controlling device, instead, he shows a remote controller to control the camera by giving appropriate commands and giving a "go" command (Figure 9), this way the system can automatically track at least one remote controller device. These two methods are considered analogous, obvious variations at the time of invention. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to remember the field of views in the remote controller and automatically tracking at least one remote controller, in the device of Fabris, to improve the functions of the remote controllers, by individually controlling the camera to a predetermined position. Further, issuing the commands from each of the remote controller devices to remember different fields of view of the camera was shown above. Remembering the remote controller that issued a command (Column 34, Line 57) MCID is entity ID of the touch screen of the remote controller, giving commands.

In regards to **claim 52**, see discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 53**, see discussion in claim 51. As disclosed in claim 1, the camera can be moved to the different field of view remembered by the remote controller issuing command was discussed above.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 54**, see discussion in claim 51. Further, obviously when six different preset conditions are remembered, it is with respect to a known reference.

In regards to **claim 55**, see discussion in claim 51. Further, as can be seen in controlling the position of camera (Figure 9), both planes can be controlled. Obviously when the position of camera is remembered it is in both directions by Pan, tilt, zoom and focus.

In regards to **claim 56**, see discussion in claim 55.

In regards to **claim 57**, see discussion in claims 51 and 55.

In regards to **claim 59**, see discussion in claims 51 and 55.

In regards to **claim 60**, see discussion in claims 51 and 55. The operator may change the pan or tilt while maintaining the same zoom perspective.

In regards to **claim 63**, see discussion in claim 51. Further, Dispatcher is shown as executive to control the operation (Column 24, Line 25 to Column.25, Line 60), and DHT device handler task is discussed (Column 25, Line 60 to Column 26, Line 2), which shows a command from one remote controller can be overridden by other remote controller.

In regards to **claim 64**, see discussion in claim 53.

In regards to **claim 65**, see discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 66**, see discussion in claim 51. Further, selecting one of the previously stored settings would allow any control device to recall a specific field.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 67**, see discussion in claim 51. Further, issuing command from a remote controller consistently by giving a new command and go command will provide automatic tracking of the remote control device.

In regards to **claim 68**, see discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 69**, see discussion in claim 51. Further, each control device can selectively store the different field of view position of each camera and as previously discussed remember the control device to issue the command.

In regards to **claim 70**, see discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 71**, see discussion in claim 59.

In regards to **claim 72**, see discussion in claim 51. Further Fabris discloses allowing the control device to selectively choose the video display that the video output signal of each camera is displayed (Column 9, Lines 37-43). It would have been obvious that one of these selections could not be to display the video output.

In regards to **claim 73**, see discussion in claim 51 and 72.

In regards to **claim 74**, see discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 75**, see discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 76**, Fabris discloses a control device for regulating the transmission of video and audio signal of a conference (Column 3, Lines 20-25). It would be obvious to treat the

Art Unit: 2712

audio signal in the same manner as the operator selects to transmit and present the corresponding video signal. See also the discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 77**, see discussion in claim 76.

In regards to **claim 78**, see discussion in claim 76.

In regards to **claim 79**, see discussion in claim 76.

In regards to **claim 83**, see the discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 84**, see discussion in claim 51. Further, by the operator continuously selecting pan or tilt would allow for automatic tracking as the command is being continuously executed.

In regards to **claim 85**, see discussion in claims 51. Cessation of command is equivalent to overriding of command.

In regards to **claim 86**, see the discussion in claim 72.

In regards to **claim 87**, see the discussion in claim 73.

In regards to **claim 88**, see the discussion in claim 66.

In regards to **claim 89**, see the discussion in claim 67.

In regards to **claim 90**, see the discussion in claim 63.

In regards to **claim 91**, see the discussion in claim 51 and 63. The operator may select not to override subsequent future commands which allows the other control device to resume issuing commands.

In regards to **claim 92**, see the discussion in claim 51.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 93**, see the discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 94**, see the discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 95**, see the discussion in claim 84.

In regards to **claim 96**, as discussed in claim 51, Fabris discloses plural control devices.

Each control device allows the operator to command the cameras to pan, tilt, zoom , and provide automatic tracking of the control device. If the conference center comprised plural operators it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to not only provide automatic tracking of the commanding control device but, also provide the option of automatic tracking of the other control device. Offering the operator the user-friendliness of automatic tracking of either the control device or another control device would have provided a great additional benefit.

In regards to **claim 97**, see the discussion in claims 85 and 96. Further, Fabris discloses the operator issuing a list of commands which could include automatic tracking followed by a cancel command.

In regards to **claim 98**, see the discussion in claim 76.

In regards to **claim 99**, see the discussion in claim 77.

In regards to **claim 100**, see the discussion in claim 78.

In regards to **claim 101**, see the discussion in claim 84.

In regards to **claim 102**, see the discussion in claim 80.

In regards to **claim 103**, see the discussion in claim 77.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 104**, see the discussion in claim 79.

In regards to **claim 105**, see the discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 106**, see the discussion in claim 51. Further, Fabris discloses a microprocessor with the ability to store different positions for different fields of view which would require a memory means.

In regards to **claim 107**, see the discussion in claim 51.

In regards to **claim 108**, see the discussion in claim 51.

3. Claims 58, 61, and 62 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fabris et al in further view of Blackshear

In regards to **claim 58**, Fabris shows remembering the position of the camera in two planes of different positions, and changing positions as controlled, by changing pan, tilt, zoom and focus as discussed above. However, Fabris does not show remembering iris position and iris being controlled. Remembering iris and controlling iris from remote controller is well known in the art as shown by Blackshear (Figure 3), where iris along with zoom, focus, pan and tilt. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to also include the control of iris along with pan, tilt, zoom and focus and also remembering the iris value for different positions as shown by Blackshear, in the remote control device of the teleconferencing of Fabris, to provide iris control of the camera so that the image to be displayed will be improved.

In regards to **claim 61**, see the discussion in claim 58.

Art Unit: 2712

In regards to **claim 62**, see the discussion in claim 58.

4. Claims 80, 81, and 82 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fabris et al in further view of Sano et al.

In regards to **claim 80**, Fabris discloses the video conference center for selectively transmitting several camera fields and associated audio. However, Fabris does not explicitly disclose the use of three or more conference sites. Sano does disclose the use of three or more conference sites (Abstract). Allowing more participants to video conference at one time would have been a desirable feature of the video conference. Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide multiple conference sites and control devices for the video conference. See also the discussion in claims 51 and 77.

In regards to **claim 81**, see the discussion in claim 80.

In regards to **claim 82**, see the discussion in claim 80.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Ashida et al. discloses a teleconferencing system with automatic tracking.

6. **Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Art Unit: 2712

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

Or:

(703) 308-5399 (for informal or draft communications, please label

"PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121

Crystal Drive, Arlington, Virginia. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrew Martin whose telephone number is (703) 305-0411. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 7:30 to 5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wendy Garber can be reached on (703) 305-4929.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

AM

ADM 3/12/99

W. Garber
Wendy Garber
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2700